



APPLICATION NUMBER	10/691,890
FILING DATE	10/16/03
FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	USACHELER
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	

EXAMINER	Bareford
PART UNIT	1792
PAPER NUMBER	

DATE MAILED:

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) K. Bareford
(2) F. Hayhurst
(3) J. Roper
(4) M. Devon

Date of interview: 10/11/07

Type: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Televised Conference ☒ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☒ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 1+

Identification of prior art discussed: Yokota, Asano

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed

idea of using cationic starch in claims as reactive material and

unexpected benefits from doing so. Also discussed Asano materials and

possible use of other specific reactive materials. The examiner noted that

this would raise new issues after now

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 21.04.) If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to another form.

Kur05/1